UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,246	04/23/2004	Mark C. Boomer	101896-0242 (DEP5294)	3245
21125 7590 06/09/2010 NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP			EXAMINER	
SEAPORT WE	ST	FISHER, ELANA BETH		
BOSTON, MA	BOULEVARD 02210-2604		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3733	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/09/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@nutter.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/709,246	BOOMER ET AL.
Examiner induced interview cummary	Examiner	Art Unit
	ELANA B. FISHER	3733
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>ELANA B. FISHER</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>CHRISTINA SPERRY</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 25 May 2010	Time: <u>10:30 AM</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicat Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: 35 U.S.C. 112, 1 ST Paragraph rejection of independent claims 1	and 23.	
Claims discussed: 1, 23		
Prior art documents discussed: N/A		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate of directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate of did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar 	e examiner will provide a writter record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Elana B Fisher/ Examiner, Art Unit 3733	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted applicant's representative to discuss applicant's response to the 112 1st paragraph rejection in the prior non-final rejection. Examiner requested clarification as to the tapering of the superior and inferior surfaces of the clamp when the locking mechanism is fully distally inserted into the bore of the clamp. Applicant's representative continued to point of FIG 1C in applicant's original drawings and specifically noted that the corrected drawing were inconsistent with the original drawings. Applicant's representative supported this statement by pointing to the opening of the clamp in FIG 1C at its right end and saying that it is wider than the space between the surfaces towards the left end/near the recess where the taper begins. Examiner and applicant's representative further discussed that FIG 1C was being used to represent features of the invention in FIG 1E, which was elected by applicant on April 26, 2007. Examiner and applicant's representative did not resolve their dispute over the rejection.